State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities

RE-EVALUATION APPROVAL FORM

(NEPA Assignment Program Projects)

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been carried out by DOT&PF pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated November 3, 2017, and executed by FHWA and DOT&PF.

I. Project Information:

A. Project Name: University Avenue Rehabilitation & Widening

B. Federal Project Number: 0617003

C. State Project Number: Z63213000

D. Primary/Ancillary Project Connections: None

E. Document Type:

- ☐ CE: 23 CFR 771.117( )( )
- ☒ EA
- ☐ EIS

F. Project Scope *(Use STIP Project Description)*: Widen and reconstruct University Avenue to current standards. (NID's associated with this parent design project: NID 39655 & 29656).

G. Approval date(s) and impact summary(ies) of the original environmental document and any re-evaluations:

Approval Date of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact: September 30, 2005.

Impact Sumamary:

The Build Alternative could result in short-term impact to air quality, noise, water quality, transportation, access and economics. No permanent adverse effects to the natural environment are anticipated. Relocation assistance will be available to all residential and business relocates without discrimination. The relocation of the businesses will not adversely affect the neighborhood. Mitigation to economic impact measures will include compensation to provide in the purchase and land through the right-of-way acquisition and relocation process. A letter of agreement has been signed by the DOT&PF and DNR, Division of Parks and Recreation to relocate the recreation site entrance of the Chena River Recreation Site. The Division of Parks and recreation will continue to be consulted to ensure the functionality of the park is maintained and any changes are a net benefit to the public.

Approval Date of Previous Re-Evaluation: December 16, 2008. The conlusions and commitments of the origninal environmental document approval remain valid.

Impact Summary:

There have been no change in impact categories or to the scope of impact of the project. Changes to the project and to impact analysis consist of the following: access to the DNR and BLM offices west of University will not be removed, the access will remain right-turn-in and right-turn-out; air quality emission calculation remains valid, changes to vehicle usage include the acquisition of new-low particulate emission mass transport buses for the area (thus a lower vehicle emission is predicted in the analysis). The conclusions and commitments of the original environmental document approval remain valid.

H. List of Attachments:

Figures 1-9

Appendix A - Cultural Resources

Appendix B - Contaminated Sites

Appendic C - Air Quality

Appendix D - Traffic Noise Report

Appendix E - Section 4(f)

Appendix F - Section 6(f)

Appendix G - Public Involvement

Appendix H - Location Hydrology

Appendix I – Section 7 Consultation

II. Proposed Action:

		YES	NO
	Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
A.	Project scope?	☐	☒
B.	Project design?	☒	☐
C.	Project limits:	☒	☐
D.	Project funding sources?	☐	☒

E. Describe any changes, including prior re-evaluations, compared to original environmental document:

The project location and vicinity can be found on Figure 1. The 2008 Re-evaluation was largely a "no change" re-evaluation. The only change from the original EA noted in the 2008 Re-evaluation was that the DNR/BLM entrance west of University Avenue would not be removed as presented in the original EA. The access would instead remain right-turn-in and right-turn-out. This change is covered under the seventh bullet below.

The following summary, Table 1, and Figures 2-9 cover all changes in the project since the original 2005 EA.

Minor Access Alterations and Changes:

1. Vian Way – The median will be closed rather than open as shown in the EA (Figure 2).
2. Davis Road – This intersection will not be signalized as proposed in the EA (Figure 2). Updated traffic modeling and crash data does not support a traffic signal at this location.
3. Fire Station Access – This access will not be relocated to the north to align with 19th Avenue as proposed in the EA. Rather, the median will be open at the access and a left turn lane developed northbound only (Figure 3).
4. 19th Avenue – The median will not be open with northbound and southbound left turn lanes as proposed in the EA. The median will be closed with no left turn lanes. (Figure 3).
5. Rewak Drive – The east leg of Rewak will not be limited to one left turn and one shared through/right turn lane as proposed in the EA. The east leg will rather include a left turn lane, a through lane, and a right turn lane (Figure 4).
6. Airport Way – The north and south legs of University Avenue will include one left turn lane each rather than the two left turn lanes each proposed in the EA (Figure 5). Updated traffic modeling indicates this configuration will result in acceptable level of service with reduced right-of-way impacts.

7. DNR/BLM entrance – This entrance will not be fully closed as proposed in the EA. The entrance will instead remain open to right-in/right-out access and a right turn pocket will be constructed (Figure 5).
8. Utility Lines – It is now proposed to bore the existing overhead power and communications lines underground, beneath the Chena River as shown on Figure 6.
9. Residential Driveway Change – The location of a residential property driveway entrance was shifted 150 feet to the west (Figure 6).
10. Halvorson Road - It is now proposed to repave all of Halvorson Road as shown on Figures 6 and 7.
11. Driveway Consolidation (Widener Lane to Geist Road) – Several common driveway accesses were eliminated after detailed analysis of impacts to existing structure and property use. Driveways that remain are right-in, right-out except the common driveway access across from Indiana Avenue that was shown in the original EA (Figure 7).
12. Sandvik Street/High School Access Road – This intersection will not be signalized as proposed in the EA. A High Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) pedestrian crossing beacon is currently proposed at this intersection (Figure 8).
13. Thomas Street - The median will not be closed at this street as proposed in the EA. The median will be open and the project will end at the southern boundary of the intersection (Figure 9).
14. Bus Turnouts Throughout - One bus turnout was added 200-ft south of Holden Road (Figure 3). One bus turnout was added immediately south of the DNR/BLM access (Figure 5). One bus turnout between Airport Way and Geraghty Avenue has been eliminated from the design (Figure 5) due to right-of-way constraints. Two bus turnouts were relocated; one moved 500-ft south opposite Widener Lane (Figure 7) to reduce property impacts, and one was moved 100-ft south near to Sandvik Street (Figure 8) to provide greater distance from the railroad crossing.

Greater Access Alterations and Changes

1. Wolf Run – This road will not remain open to right-in/right-out access as proposed in the EA. Wolf Run will instead be closed and traffic rerouted to the Halvorson Road/Indiana Avenue intersection to consolidate an access point (Figure 7). Wolf Run will be reconfigured as a loop road, eliminating the cul-de-sac and improving traffic flow and access (Figure 8). Direct access to University Avenue was eliminated due to safety and capacity needs at the Johansen/Geist intersection. Relocating the access back to Indiana Avenue will result in improved intersection level of service and improved safety.
2. Geist Road/Johansen Expressway – The east and west legs of the Geist Road/Johansen Expressway intersection with University Avenue will not be limited to including one left turn lane as proposed in the EA. Rather, two left turn lanes will be included for each leg (Figure 8). This change, due to updated traffic modeling, resulted in a larger intersection functional area, requiring approximately 600-ft of new median along Geist Road to channelize traffic and reduce crashes. Work on the Johansen Expressway also extends approximately 300-ft further east than originally proposed due to final turn pocket lengths and configuration (Figure 8). The 300-ft project limit extension on Johansen Expressway and Geist Road was taken into consideration during the environmental consequence analysis below.

III. Purpose and Need:

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes in the project purpose and need from that described in the original environmental document?	☐	☒

Describe any changes:

IV. Environmental Consequences

	YES	NO

Identify (yes or no) if there have been any changes in project impacts from those identified in the original environmental document, including prior re-evaluations. For each "yes", describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments compared to the original environmental document. Attach any supporting analysis or studies.

1.	Have there been any changes in the affected environment within or adjacent to the project area that could affect any of the impact categories (e.g. new regulations, transportation infrastructure, protected resources, land use plans, etc.)?	☒	☐

2. Describe any changes:

Since the time of the original environmental document:

- The Fairbanks PM 2.5 nonattainment area was designated by the EPA of December 14, 2009. As a result the project now lies within a nonattainment area for PM 2.5, requiring air quality conformity analysis.
- Additional real estate acquisitions and building removals are proposed beyond those in the EA.
- The age of structures has increased, requiring consideration of cultural resources impacts to additional structures that have reached 45 years of age or older.
- Standards for wetland delineation have been updated as presented in the September 2007 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Alaska Region (Version 2.0) requiring updated wetland and waters delineation and determination of impacts.
- New and updated land use and transportation plans have been developed requiring confirmation that the project continues to be consistent with current plans as noted in the EA.
- Traffic projections have changed requiring re-evaluation of project effects to air and noise quality.
- The Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) Noise Policy has been updated requiring re-evaluation of noise impacts and noise abatement measures.
- The Alaska DEC rather than the EPA is now responsible for the General Permit for Construction Activities and MS4 Permit.

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

		YES	NO
	Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1.	Right-of-way requirements for the project?	☒	☐
2.	Project effects on minority or low income populations as defined in E.O. 12898 (FHWA Order 6640.23A, June 2012)?	☐	☒
3.	Project use of ANILCA land?	☐	☒

4. Describe any changes:

Changes in right-of-way acquisition are proposed from that presented in the original environmental document. The changes and rationale for changes are summarized below.

Table 1. ROW Impacts	2006 FONSI	2018 Re-Evaluation	Change
Number of properties impacted by ROW acquisition	79	108	29
Number of properties requiring total acquisition	5	13	8
Number of properties with relocations required	5	8	3

Acres of Permanent Strip Acquisitions	5.7	12.3	6.6
Acres of Total Acquisitions	1.8	6.0	4.2
Acres of Permanent Easements	0.0	1.1	1.1
Acres of Permanent ROW Acquisition (Not Including Easements)	7.5	18.4	10.8

Changes in Strip Acquisitions: (Figures 2, 6-8)

1. Final drainage design resulted in additional parcels being identified for partial acquisition or drainage easements due to required ditching for this relatively flat corridor. Drainage easements for Segment 1 were required to allow for storm drain outfalls to pass through grass swales before discharging into Noyes Slough, an impaired water body.
2. Final roadway design and grading resulted in several additional strip acquisitions, in particular between the Chena River Bridge and the Geist/Johansen intersection. The initial design model was based on an older survey, and updated survey data and design standards resulted in an expansion of the roadway footprint.
3. Lessons learned from previous urban reconstruction projects resulted in providing additional ROW beyond slope limits for constructability and maintenance purposes. Providing insufficient ROW beyond finished slopes results in facilities that are difficult to maintain (both for grass mowing and snow removal). Construction traffic impacts are also exacerbated if equipment can't work on the non-traffic side of the roadway due to tight ROW limits.
4. Utility relocations, in particular the required telecommunications duct bank relocations, resulted in additional strip acquisitions throughout west side of the project. The utility duct bank was moved to the edge of the roadway (and right-of-way) to eliminate impacts to motorists during system maintenance and inspection.
5. Completion of cost to cure documents for the Golden Heart Veterinary Clinic (GHVC) identified that parking could not be cured on the existing property. Acquisition of additional area from the adjacent vacant property, owned by Alaska Riverways, was identified as the most cost effective way to cure parking (Figure 7). This property was already being impacted for strip acquisitions due to the University Avenue widening and the extension of Halvorson Road, and the portion that could be used for parking for GHVC would have been cut off from the main property by the Halvorson Road extension. Alternative parking locations included the adjacent lots on the Widener Lane side, however these lots have a structure on them and would have required tenant relocations and structure removal to cure the parking. If the parking was not cured on the Alaska Riverways lot, a full business relocation would have been required. Acquiring the remainder of the isolated portion of the Alaska Riverways lot is the most cost effective and least impactful solution to cure impacts to the GHVC caused by the project.
6. Murakami (between Chena River Bridge and Goldizen west, Figure 6). The Murakami property was originally identified as a partial take, however the original design did not include removal of the structure. The property consists of a structure that is occasionally rented out. During detailed design it was identified that the front porch of the structure would require removal for the roadway improvements (within the area of the strip acquisition), and due to the configuration of the existing structure a partial demolition was not feasible resulting in total demolition of the structure being required. Further utility design to relocate utilities away from bridge construction resulted in placement of a large power vault on the Murakami property, further increasing the size of the necessary take. Due to the existing overhead power lines and the size of equipment needed to install the vault, access for constructing the vault required use of additional area of the lot.

Descriptions of reasons for additional strip acquisitions for individual properties are provided on Figures 2, and 6-8.

Changes to Total Acquisitions:

Oines Property – See Figure 6

During appraisals and acquisitions, the property's heating oil tank was discovered to be within the strip acquisition area for the roadway improvements. Due to the configuration and size of the property that would remain, it was determined infeasible to relocate the fuel tank, requiring a total acquisition of the property. The seller requested a total acquisition. The property also was determined as a viable alternate access route to the utility bore area and structures, as well as for driveway access to the two neighboring residential properties, minimizing impacts to the adjacent parcels. This property required a tenant relocation.

Schaeffer Property (Chena River adjacent) – See Figure 6

During detailed design, bridge staging areas were identified requiring more ROW than planned. The Schaeffer property was identified as the best location for bridge staging and the property owner was interested in selling their entire interest. The property had a house on it, which has since been demolished following property acquisition (with State funds).

Holiday House Apartments (2 additional parcels) – See Figure 7

During ROW negotiations it was discovered that the cost of partial acquisition exceeded the cost of total acquisition due to the location of the heating system for the apartment buildings. The proposed acquisition required removal of the main utility building resulting in the need to construct a new main utility building and duct system for the remaining apartment buildings. The acquisition resulted in removal of 60 residential units and tenant relocations in accordance with the Uniform Act.

Wolf Run Properties (2 additional parcels) – See Figure 8

The Wolf Run approach was moved out of the functional area of the Geist/Johansen intersection after final intersection geometry was completed due to the traffic study updates. This resulted in needing to route Wolf Run around, rather than a cul-de-sac configuration, to get traffic to the new Indiana Avenue with minimum adverse travel, resulting in the acquisition of two vacant parcels. There is a burned, abandoned structure on one of the parcels that will require removal.

Solomon Property (between Johansen Expy and Dead End Alley) – See Figure 8

The EA identified that a portion of the building on this property would need to be removed due to the slope limits, but it was originally anticipated that the rest of the structure could remain. After working through the final impacts and details of the structure, a total acquisition was determined necessary. This property does require relocation of tenants. The two properties adjacent were planned total acquisitions with relocations during the EA and those properties have been acquired and the structures have been demolished.

TL 510 & 544 (between Sandvik St and ARRC) – See Figure 8

These vacant parcels were identified for total acquisition following final design. The bus pullout shown in the EA was immediately adjacent to the railroad crossing which was determined to be difficult to use and potentially a safety hazard. The bus pullout was relocated onto TL 510 and 544, requiring total acquisition of the parcels. TL 510 was put up for sale during design.

B. Social and Cultural Impacts	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the project's effect on the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Neighborhoods or community cohesion?	☐	☒
2. Travel patterns and accessibility (e.g. vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian)?	☒	☐
3. Schools, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc.?	☒	☐
4. Elderly, handicapped, non-drivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic	☐	☒

B. Social and Cultural Impacts YES NO

groups, or the economically disadvantaged?

5. Unresolved project issues or concerns of a federally recognized Indian Tribe [as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(m)]? ☐ ☒

6. Describe any changes:

Changes related to vehicle travel patterns and accessibility are listed below.

1. Vian Way – The median would be closed rather than open as shown in the EA (Figure 2). Vian Way is not currently constructed to this median break location, and access is currently provided from University Avenue to houses off of Vian Way by way of Davis Road, where a median break will remain. The existing approach currently functions as a second driveway for a car rental business. This business will be restricted to right-in right-out access and vehicles would have to make a u-turn at Davis Road if desiring to exit and head south, or they could travel north to the Airport Way intersection and utilize Airport Way to access southern routes. Emergency services, which currently exist north of this approach, would have to make a u-turn at the Mitchell Expressway signalized intersection to access this business, as would customers desiring to access the business coming from the north. Alternatively customers traveling south on University Avenue could go west on Airport Way to the Mitchell Expressway to go north on University Avenue from the Mitchell Expressway intersection with University. The majority of customers for this business originate at the Fairbanks International Airport, which is located south and no special maneuvers would typically be required to access the business for the majority of customers.
2. Fire Station Access – This access will not be relocated to the north to align with 19th Avenue as proposed in the EA. Rather, the median will be open at the access and a left turn lane developed northbound only (Figure 3). This will reduce emergency response time by utilizing the existing shorter driveway as compared to the EA. 19th Avenue traffic can go to the median break at Erickson Avenue (approximately 700-ft away) to make a u-turn to head south. 19th Avenue currently only serves 5 lots, all of which are owned by Fountainhead Development and can access Erickson directly through the Fountainhead parking lot. The lots consist of a retail business, the Sophie Station hotel, restaurant and apartments, and support buildings for the complex.
3. 19th Avenue – The median will not be open with northbound and southbound left turn lanes as proposed in the EA. The median will be closed with no left turn lanes. (Figure 3). See discussion regarding Fire Station Access for anticipated impacts.
4. DNR/BLM entrance – This entrance will not be fully closed as proposed in the EA. The entrance will instead remain open to right-in/right-out access and a right turn pocket will be constructed (Figure 5). With the addition of the right turn pocket no adverse impacts are anticipated to main University Avenue traffic as there are no other intersections for several hundred feet.
5. Residential Driveway Change – The location of a residential property driveway entrance was shifted 150 feet to the east (Figure 6). This is a minor access change based on discussions with the property owner.
6. Driveway Consolidation (Widener Lane to Geist Road) – Several common driveway accesses were eliminated after detailed analysis of impacts to existing structure and property use. Driveways that remain are right-in, right-out except the common driveway access across from Indiana Avenue that was shown in the original EA (Figure 7). These changes are not anticipated to significantly adversely impact traffic flow on University Avenue based on the low turning movement volumes these properties generate.
7. Wolf Run – This road will not remain open to right-in/right-out access as proposed in the EA. Wolf Run will instead be closed and traffic rerouted to the Halvorson Road/Indiana Avenue

intersection to consolidate an access point (Figure 7). Wolf Run will be reconfigured as a loop road, eliminating the cul-de-sac and improving traffic flow and access (Figure 8). Direct access to University Avenue was eliminated due to safety and capacity needs at the Johansen/Geist intersection. Relocating the access back to Indiana Avenue will result in improved intersection level of service and improved safety. Emergency response time and business access is anticipated to be improved with the new configuration. Currently vehicles may have to wait for several signal cycles before traffic queues clear the current intersection. By relocating access to Indiana Avenue ingress and egress will require less wait time.

8. Thomas Street - The median will not be closed at this street as proposed in the EA. The median will be open and the project will end at the southern boundary of the intersection (Figure 9). This change improves access to businesses, residents, and emergency response time to the structures for facilities in the Thomas Street area. It is not anticipated to significantly adversely impact traffic flow on University Avenue.

Where accesses will be closed, consolidated, and/or rerouted, this will be done to meet the purpose and need of the project to improve intersection safety and to reduce the high crash rate on University Avenue and its high traffic volume intersections. Where accesses will remain open, this will be done to maintain convenient access where that access does not pose a substantial safety concern.

The FNSB bus route maps for the area were evaluated for impacts and no routes will require re-routing due to the median break locations.

C. Economic Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the project's potential effect on the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. To have adverse economic impacts on the regional and/or local economy, such as the effects of the project on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales?	☐	☒
2. To have adverse effect on established businesses or business districts?	☐	☒

3. Describe any changes:

Two access changes have the most potential to affect businesses. A review of these access changes, however, finds no adverse effects.

1. The driveway consolidation that is no longer planned west of University (Figure 7) would maintain existing driveway conditions resulting in no net effect on surrounding businesses.

2. The closure of Wolf Run Road and redirecting of customers to access by way of Indiana Avenue would have some effect on businesses in this vicinity. The proposed access to the Wolf Run Restaurant and nearby businesses would be less conveniently direct, but the misdirection is minimal and as a tradeoff customers would have safer passage onto and off of University Avenue to and from the businesses. Due to traffic congestion that currently exists at the Wolf Run intersection, customers may actually find it more convenient with the new routing of traffic. In addition, the roadway improvements will improve visibility for Wolf Run Restaurant. The offsetting effects are viewed as a net neutral effect.

D. Local Land Use and Transportation Plan

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Local land use or transportation plan(s)?	☒	☐
2. The potential for the project to have adverse indirect and cumulative effects on land use or transportation?	☐	☒
3. Is the project, as currently proposed, consistent with current land use and transportation plans?	☒	☐

D. Local Land Use and Transportation Plan YES NO

4. Describe any changes:

While new and updated land use and transportation plans have been developed, a review of these current plans for the project area was completed and it has been determined that the project continues to be consistent with current plans as noted in the EA.

Land Use Plans

The 2005 Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) Regional Comprehensive Plan, referenced as a draft in the EA has since been finalized. The project is consistent with the plan's transportation and infrastructure goal #1:

- Strategy #1, page 21, "Encourage, design and maintenance of roads based on their function and community needs."
- Strategy #3, page 22, "Make the Borough more pedestrian-friendly in urban and suburban areas and safer in rural remote areas."

The January 12, 2016 FNSB Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy has also been completed since the approval of the EA on 9/30/2005 and the EA Reevaluation on 12/16/2008. The project is also consistent with this plan. The project meets the physical infrastructure objective (page 6, page 107) regarding the sustainability of current infrastructure specifically to "support the design, construction, and maintenance of trail, road, and air transportation systems that improve access to the region."

Local Transportation Plan - The project is also consistent with the Interior Alaska Transportation Plan (November 2010), Goal #4, Objective A to preserve the existing transportation facilities and extending the life of these facilities by ensuring that deficient highways are brought to compliance with standards.

E. Impacts to Historic Properties YES NO

Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:

		YES	NO
1.	Involvement of any road that is included on the "List of Roads Treated as Eligible" in the Alaska Historic Roads PA?	☐	☒
2.	Project qualifications as a Programmatic Allowance under the Section 106 programmatic Agreement?	☐	☒
3.	The status of National Register-listed or eligible sites in the project area?	☒	☐
4.	Conclusions reached in the original environmental document regarding the project's effect on cultural and historical resources?	☒	☐
5.	Project activities described in consultation or findings letters previously submitted SHPO or other consulting parties?	☒	☐

6. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The project's area of potential effect was reevaluated by NLUR in March/April 2015 taking into account project changes. This updated the 2004 evaluation. The 2015 evaluation considered all building, structures, and objects that reached 45 years of age by 2015. Tanana Valley Railroad (TVRR) (FAI-00230) was found eligible for the National Register. The TVRR, a narrow gauge railroad constructed in 1904-1905, was originally determined eligible in 1992 under Criterion A as the first railroad serving mining camps in the Fairbanks Mining District. It retains its eligibility. SHPO has concurred. The Railroad Crossing on University Avenue (FAI-2378) was determined not eligible. However, SHPO did not concur.

Both sites (FAI-00230 and FAI-2378) have been previously affected by previous improvements at the road crossing and proposed improvements are in-kind. Therefore, FHWA updated its project finding from no historic properties affected (4/22/2005) to no adverse effect to historic properties (7/1/2015). SHPO concurred with the finding in their 7/15/2015. Additional information sent to SHPO 3/9/2018 to resolve the non-concurrence on the determination of eligibility for FAI-2378. DOT&PF maintained that the crossing was not eligible and does not contribute to the eligibility of the Tanana Valley Railroad (FAI-00230); with the additional information, SHPO concurred that the crossing is not eligible and reconfirmed their concurrence with the finding of no historic properties affected. Section 106 documentation is located in Appendix A.

F. Wetlands Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Project wetland impacts? *If yes, complete a through d and resource agency coordination is required.*	☐	☒
a. List total acres of impact (original/changed): 0.12/0.12		
b. List total fill quantities in wetlands (original/changed): No Est./20,000cy		
c. List total dredge quantities (original/changed): Not Applicable		
d. Have mitigation measures changed?	☐	☒

2. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The 2005 EA reported 0.17 acres of permanent impacts to waters of which 0.12 acres were to wetlands. An updated wetland delineation was completed in the summer of 2016. The 2005 EA wetland delineation was based largely on the National Wetlands Inventory. The 2016 wetland delineation was based on field data collected in accordance the most recent standards in the September 2007 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Alaska Region (Version 2.0). Despite some minor changes in mapped wetlands the total estimated acres of permanent wetland losses remained the same at 0.12 acres. Riverine impacts are treated in the next section under water body involvement.

There are no changes in mitigation or environmental commitments related to wetlands. Mitigation will remain in accordance with the Corps of Engineers 404 permit conditions.

G. Water Body Involvement

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the project's effects on the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Water bodies?	☒	☐
2. Navigable water body as defined by USCG (Section 9)?	☐	☒
3. Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 404)?	☐	☒
4. Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 10)?	☐	☒
5. Fish passage across a stream frequented by salmon or other fish (i.e. Title 16.05.841)?	☐	☒
6. A resident fish stream (Title 16.05.841)?	☐	☒
7. A catalogued anadromous fish stream (Title 16.05.871)?	☐	☒
8. A designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River?	☐	☒

9. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The 2005 EA noted that impacts to the Chena River would affect a USCG Section 9 navigable waterway, a USACE Section 404 water of the U.S., a USACE Section 10 navigable waterway, a resident fish stream, and an anadromous fish stream. These reported effects remain true.

The 2005 EA reported 0.17 acres of permanent impacts to waters of which 0.12 were to wetlands, and 0.05 acres were to riverine classified wetland areas including the Chena River and Deadman's Slough.

The estimated impact to Deadman's Slough (0.02 acres) has not changed from the EA estimate.

With more detailed design of the bridge replacement at the Chena River crossing, the estimated impact to the Chena River has increased from the 2005 EA estimate of 0.03 acres to the current estimate of 0.21 acres. The net result is an increase of 0.18 acres of impact to the Chena River due to the bridge replacement.

Total permanent impacts to waterbodies (including Deadman's Slough and the Chena River) has increased from 0.05 to 0.23 acres. Total permanent impacts to both wetlands (Section F) and waterbodies (Section G) have changed from 0.17 acres to 0.35 acres. All quantity changes are a result of a 0.18 acre increase in impact to the Chena River from that reported in the EA. Impact acres to wetlands and to Deadman's Slough remain unchanged from that reported in the EA. Table 1 below summarizes Water Resource impacts.

There are no changes in mitigation or environmental commitments related to waterbodies. Mitigation related to waterbodies will remain in accordance with environmental permit conditions.

Table 2. Water Body Involvement Impact Totals

	2005 EA	**2008 Re-Eval**	**2018 Re-Eval**
Total Impact to Waters	**0.17 acres**	**0.17 acres**	**0.35 acres**
Wetlands	0.12 acres	0.12 acres	0.12 acres
Chena River	0.03 acres	0.03 acres	**0.21 acres**
Deadman's Slough	0.02 acres	0.02 acres	0.02 acres

H. Fish and Wildlife Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the project's effects on the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Anadromous or resident fish habitat?	☐	☒
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)?	☐	☒
3. Wildlife resources?	☐	☒
4. Bald eagles or golden eagles?	☐	☒
5. Migratory birds?	☐	☒

6. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The original EA noted that impacts to the Chena River would affect a resident fish stream, and an anadromous fish stream, and Essential Fish Habitat. There have been no changes in the fisheries resources/species present or the conclusions regarding effects. Mitigation measures havve changed slightly due to ongoing coordination, and are in accordance with the stipulation in the DFG Fish Habitat and other environmental permits. With implementation of the following conservation measures the project would have no adverse effect to fish or their habitat.

1. The replacement structure will be designed to minimize encroachments into the Chena River.
2. The construction contractor will be required to comply with the conditions outlined in the Fish Habitat Permit. Permit conditions are expected to prohibit gravel causeways in the Chena River and to require that the old bridge piers be cut off to no more than 1 foot above the footer. It is anticipated that willows will be required to be planted within riprap areas outside the bridge limits. .
3. Seasonal work restrictions, as defined by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in their Fish Habitat Permit, for in-water work in the Chena River will be followed. It is anticipated that the pile driving will be restricted to avoid the time period between June 30 and August 15 unless sound pressure levels are less than 220 dbA. Pile driving may be allowed within a 4-hour daytime widow between June 30 to August 15. Sound attenuation measures such as bubble nets may be required to be on hand and ready to be used to keep sound levels no greater than 220 dbA.

4. The construction contractor will be required to comply with the APDES permit to minimize water quality effects to the river.

There have been no changes in the type or status wildlife that utilize the project area. The project would continue to have no adverse effects to wildlife. No bald eagles are identified in the project area. The project would continue to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E) Impacts	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. The status of listed, proposed or candidate T&E species that will be directly or indirectly affected by the project?	☐	☒
2. The status of critical habitat in the project area?	☐	☒
3. The project's effect on listed, proposed or candidate T&E species or designated critical habitat?	☐	☒

4. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The 2005 EA concluded that according to the USFWS no threatened, endangered or candidate species are located in or near the project area. There continues to be no listed, proposed, or candidate T&E species and no critical habitat in the project area. On January 18, 2018 a Section 7 Consultation through the USFWS iPAC database was conducted which confirmed the 2005 EA conclusions that no T&E sprecies are present in or near the projet area. The Section 7 Consultation can be found in Appendix I.

J. Invasive Species	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. The measures that will be used to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species?	☒	☐
2. The project's consistency with E.O. 13112 (Invasive Species)?	☒	☐

3. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

A 1/19/2018 review of the AKEPIC database found that bird vetch (vicia cracca) occurs in the vicinity of the proposed project disturbance area with an average infested area of 0.1 acre(s).

The project would include the following practical measures to minimize the spread of non-native species: 1) Avoiding the use of listed noxious species for landscaping and erosion control purposes. 2) Planning construction activities to minimize disturbed areas. 3) Timely seeding of project-disturbed areas with non-invasive species providing adequate cover.

With the implementation of practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species, the project is expected to result in no substantial invasive species-related impacts.

K. Contaminated Sites	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. The status of known or potentially contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW?	☒	☐
2. Any proposed excavation dewatering within 1,500 feet of a known contaminated site?	☒	☐
3. The potential for encountering a contaminated site during construction?	☐	☒

4. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

Since substantial time has passed since the original Phase 1 Contaminated Sites Assessments for this project it was determined prudent to update previous Phase 1 assessments to address potential changes in contamination

conditions and risks. In some cases earlier identified contamination may have migrated to new areas. Some contamination has been cleaned up. There is potential to discover new contamination or contamination sources. In addition there have been changes in the project design.

For these reasons, an updated Phase 1 Contaminated Site Investigation for the project was completed in October 2015. The purpose of this 2015 Phase 1 investigation was to compile information from the two previous Phase 1 investigations (1990 and 2003) and to update this information to reflect the risks of encountering contamination with the current contamination conditions and project design. The limits of the 2015 Phase 1 project review area consisted of those areas where substantial construction excavation is proposed, where right-of way acquisition is proposed, and within 1 mile of the construction-dewatering activities. The Phase I investigation included a records review, field review, and agency interviews.

A summary of the 2015 report findings and recommendations can be found in Appendix B. No concerns were found within the existing or proposed right-of-way. 38 sites of interest adjacent to the project right-of-way were identified. Of the 38, 8 were determined to have potential for encountering contamination by way of surface or groundwater migration into the work area, with half of the sites determined low potential and half determined medium potential. One of the sites with medium potential (Kayak Building at 3550 Geraghty Avenue) involves right-of-way acquisition, however the identified contamination is not near the proposed right-of-way or proposed excavation. To mitigate the risk of groundwater or surface water contamination, construction work that may require de-watering near these sites (typically water and sewer line installations) will be completed during periods of low groundwater. An Excavation Dewatering General Permits will be acquired if necessary.

In January, 2018 an updated search of the ADEC Contaminated Sites database was conducted and revealed that there are two new active sites within the project area, and updates made to existing cleanup complete sites and one preexisting active site. The following summarizes the latest site updates that have occurred since the October 2015 Phase I Contaminated Site Investigation:

1. Hazard ID 26789 - 2151 University Avenue South, ADOT&PF - New Active Site: potential UST diesel spill, entered into ADEC database on 10/17/2017. The ADOT&PF is conducting a Phase II Site Assessment to characterize and close out potential contamination at this site before further development occurs.
2. Hazard ID 26459 - 201 University Avenue, Splash & Dash Car Wash - New Active Site: two UST gasoline and diesel spills, entered into ADEC database on 10/8/2015. Clean up was initated 10/9/2015, a subsequent work plan was reviewed and revised by ADEC, corrective action plan was developed 4/28/2016 and was executed in August 2017. This site is located within 1500 feet where excavation dewatering may occur, further coordination with ADEC will be conducted to secure an Excavation Dewatering General Permit if necessary.
3. Hazard ID 25532 - 3755 Airport Way, Fred Meyer West - Cleanup Complete with Institutional Controls: UST diesel spill, Cleanup Complete Determination issued & instutional constrols entered into ADEC database on 8/22/2017.
4. Hazard ID 4103 - 685 Indiana Avenue, Residence - Cleanup Complete with Institutional Controls: UST diesel spill, Instuitutional Control Periodic Reporting, building owner was located and no changes to land use have occurred. Land owner is in contact with ADEC for coordination future land development. 11/17/2017.
5. Hazard ID 26489 - 655 Univeristy Avenue, ADOT&PF Former Holiday House Apartments - Active Site: contaminated soil. ADEC reviewed and approved a work plan for additional soil and groundwater sampling on 10/13/2017.
6. Hazard ID 24247 - 3679 College Road, Tesoro - Active Site: petroleum contamination in soil and groundwater. ADEC reviewed monitoring event reports completed between December 2016 and December 2017, and issued written approval of a work plan to install confirmation oil soil borings and groundwater monitoring wells in 2018.

7. Hazard ID 550 - Tanana Loop, UAF Physical Plant - Cleanup Complete with Institutional Controls: ground water contaminants. Draft work plan was reviewed and updated between 10/30/2105 and 12/17/2105, additional soils samples were requested, a Soil and Groundwater Assessment Report was received by ADEC in 5/10/2016, institutional controls were updated in August 2016, an Exposure Tracking Model Ranking was completed in 8/23/2016, and excavation dewatering was slated to occur in June/July of 2017.

Additional recommendations include giving extra consideration to not impact contaminated sites, following BMPs/SOPs and the SWPPP to avoid impacts to a contaminated area it if must be used for construction staging, , and developing a contingency plan in the event that contamination is unexpectedly encountered. These will be incorporated into the final project specifications as needed.

L. Air Quality (Conformity) YES NO

Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:

1. The project's effect on an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area, which will require a new or revised conformity determination? ☒ ☐

2. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

At the time of the project's September 30, 2005 FONSI approval and December 16, 2008 Reevaluation, the project area was not within a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated air quality nonattainment or maintenance area for fine particulate matter PM 2.5. This status has changed. The project now lies within a nonattainment area for PM 2.5. EPA designated the Fairbanks PM 2.5 nonattainment area on December 14, 2009. As a result the project has been analyzed for air quality on a regional and project level.

Regional-Level Air Quality Analysis

To evaluate air quality status on a regional level, the local unit of government was contacted to confirm that the project is part of the most recent transportation plan and has been determined to be in conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality based on a regional emissions analysis. The Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System (FMATS) completed the most recent conformity analysis for their Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Fairbanks Metropolitan Planning Area. This project was included. The most recent analysis found the transportation plans to be in conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality based on a regional emissions analysis (1/5/2015). Attached in Appendix C is DOT&PFs 4/1/2016 email correspondence with the FMATS Coordinator, Donna Gardino. In addition the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, emissions analysis, and documentation of regional air quality conformity can be found at the web links below.

MTP: http://www.dot.alaska.gov/nreg/projects/FMATS-2040-MTP.pdf

MTP Regional Conformity Analysis:
http://www.dot.alaska.gov/nreg/projects/FMATS-2040-MTP-Conformity.pdf

FMATS website noting air quality conformity approval:
http://fmats.us/programs/metropolitan-transportation-plan/

Project-Level Air Quality Analysis

To evaluate air quality status on a project level, the project was first reviewed for exemption status but found not to be exempt under 40CFR 93.126 or 93.128.

The project was then reviewed to determine whether it fits the criteria under 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) to be a project of air quality concern. The project is not specifically listed under 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as a project of air quality concern. The following descriptions characterize the project.

- The project segment of University Avenue does not carry a significant AADT. Both existing and projected AADTs are substantially less than 125,000 vehicles.
- The project segment of University Avenue does not serve a significant number of diesel vehicles (8% or 10,000 AADT) nor is the project expected to result in an increase in diesel vehicles on University Avenue.
- The project does not involve freight or bus terminals.
- The project does not involve a site that has been identified for violation or possible violation in a PM2.5 implementation plan.

On 2/4/2016 a Fairbanks, Alaska PM2.5 Hot-Spot Analysis Form for Interagency Consultation Form was sent out by email to the following air quality contacts to give opportunity for interagency comments: Cynthia Heil (Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation), Karl Pepple (Environmental Protection Agency), Ned Conroy (Federal Transit Administration), Jeremy Borrego (Federal Transit Administration), John Lohrey (Federal Highway Administration), Jeff Houk (Federal Highway Administration),Glenn Miller (Fairbanks North Star Borough), Donna Gardino (Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System), and Ron Lovell (DEC Contractor). The email notice and form are located in Appendix C. The analysis form concluded that the proposed project is not of air quality concern and therefore meets the Clean Air Act requirements and 40 CFR 93.116 without an explicit hot-spot analysis. All of those contacted had either no comment or expressed agreement with this conclusion. The FHWA (2/16/2016), Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (3/4/2016), and the Department of Environmental Conservation (3/2/2016) provided their concurrence. Individual comments received are attached in Appendix C.

On 4/4/2016 carbon monoxide (CO) conformity was addressed by DOT&PF sending out a second email notice to the same people mentioned above. The email notice is located in Appendix C. This notice was intended to confirm that the CO air quality conformity conclusions of the 2003 air analysis remain valid. The reevaluated CO analysis confirmed the original conclusion that the project would not cause or contribute to any new localized violation or increase the frequency or severity of any existing CO violations in the CO maintenance area. All of those contacted had either no comment or expressed agreement with this conclusion. The Environmental Protection Agency (5/16/2016) and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (5/17/2016) provided their concurrence. Individual comments received are attached in Appendix C.

Based on the information described above, the project conforms with the purpose of the current State Implementation Plan and the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

M. Floodplains Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. The project's encroachment into the 100-year floodplain (i.e. base floodplain in fresh or marine waters). *If yes, attach documentation of public involvement conducted per E.O. 11988 and 23 CFR 650.109. Consult with the regional or statewide Hydraulics/Hydrology expert, and attach the required location hydraulic study per* 23 CFR 650.111.	☐	☒
2. The project's potential to have significant encroachment as defined by 23 CFR 650.105(q)?	☐	☒
3. The project's potential to encroach on a regulatory floodway?	☐	☒
4. The status of local flood hazard ordinances?	☐	☒
5. The project's consistency with local flood protection standards and E.O. 11988?	☐	☒

6. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

No changes. The project would not result in 100-year floodplain or floodway encroachment different from that described in the original environmental document. Current FEMA mapping identifies the same flood-

related zones as in described in the original document. The project continues to lie mostly within Zone X, an area of the 500-year floodplain with some inclusions of Zones A and AE, special flood hazard areas likely to be inundated by the 100-year flood. The proposed action continues to involve encroachments into the 100-year floodplain and remains consistent with local flood protection standards and E.O. 11988. The Location Hydraulic Study can be found in Appendix H.

N. Noise Impacts	N/A	YES	NO
1. Does the project as currently proposed involve any of the activities, listed below, that would trigger the need for a noise analysis? Activity list:		☒	☐
a. Construction of highway on a new location.			
b. Substantial alteration in vertical or horizontal alignment as defined in 23 CFR 772.5.			
c. An increase in the number of through lanes.			
d. Addition of an auxiliary lane (except a turn lane).			
e. Addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange.			
f. Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through-traffic lane or an auxiliary lane.			
g. Addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.			
2. Was a noise analysis completed on the original project?		☒	☐
a. Was the noise analysis completed prior to implementation of the final noise rule (23 CFR 772) and the current DOT&PF Noise Policy (April 2011)? **NOTE:** If yes, the project likely needs a revised noise analysis to comply with the current noise rule.		☒	☐
3. If the project needed a noise analysis are there any newly identified noise sensitive receptors in the project area?	☐	☐	☒

4. Describe results of a new noise analysis, identification of new impacts, newly identified noise sensitive receptors or changes in noise abatement measures:

A noise analysis was completed for the project in July 2005 as part of the original environmental document (9/30/2005) in accordance with the 23 CFR 772 noise regulations and the 1996 DOT&PF noise policy. In 2011 the federal noise regulations in 23 CFR 772 were amended and DOT&PF adopted a new noise policy. In addition, since 2005 changes have occurred in traffic projections, project design, landscape features, and land uses. As a result of these changes, in January 2018 a new noise analysis was completed by the acoustic and air quality consultant Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. utilizing the Traffic Noise Model, TNM 2.5. A copy of the 2018 Noise Study Report (NSR) can be found in Appendix D. The NSR concluded that there would not be substantial noise level increases from the project (per 2011 DOT&PF Noise Policy, projected increases less than 15dBA $L_{eq[h]}$ above existing conditions does not constitute a substantial noise increase). The following summarizes the conclusions:

The 2018 NSR identified noise impacts at 4 of 35 representative receptors along the project corridor where calculated noise levels approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria. See Table 5-3 of the Appendix D noise analysis report.

Six noise barriers were evaluated to provide noise reduction to the four impacted land uses. Four of the six noise barriers were found to meet the 5 dBA acoustical feasibility criterion and to achieve the 7 dBA design goal, and were subsequently evaluated for cost reasonableness. The evaluations determined that the estimated costs to construct the four barriers exceeded the reasonable cost allowance of $37,750 per benefited receiver, meaning that they are not cost reasonable. CFR 772.13(d)(2)(iv) notes that all reasonableness factors must

collectively be achieved in order for a noise abatement measure to be deemed reasonable. Failure to achieve any one factor will result in the noise abatement measure under consideration being deemed not reasonable. Further reasonableness determination, based on views of property owners and residents was not completed for the 2018 NSR as the other required cirteria were not met with regards to feasable and reasonable.

Consideration of noise insulation for Category D uses at the Assemblies of God Mission Church and University Baptist Church was done after exhausting all reasonable outdoor analysis. Providing noise insulation in the form of forced-air mechanical ventilation would result in a noise reduction that would meet the acoustical feasibility criteria and the design goal. Quotes for the installation of forced-air mechanical ventilation for these two receptors were solicited from a licensed area contractor to evaluate the proposed abatement's cost reasonableness. The Assemblies of God Mission Church (with two benefited receptors) noise insulation was not found to be cost reasonable, as costs to construct the forced-air mechanical ventilation exceeded the reasonable cost allowance of $37,750 per benefited receiver. The University Baptist Church (with four benefited receptors) noise insulation was found to be cost reasonable, and an Environmental Commitment has been established to determine if the noise insulation abatement proposal is desirable to the property owner, and if so work with the property owner to complete noise insulation installation.

Adverse effects related to construction noise are anticipated to be localized, temporary, and transient in nature. See Chapter 7 of the noise analysis report in Appendix D for additional information.

O. Water Quality Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. The project's involvement with a public or private drinking water source?	☐	☒
2. The project's effect on discharges of storm water into Waters of the U.S.?	☐	☒
3. The project's effect on ADEC designated Impaired Waterbody?	☒	☐
4. The project's involvement with an area that is covered by a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) APDES permit?	☒	☐
5. The potential for the project's runoff to be mixed with discharges from an APDES permitted industrial facility?	☐	☒

6. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

The EPA NPDES Stormwater General Permit (now referred to as the APDES General Permit) has been assumed by the State Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), but all terms and conditions remain unchanged. To minimize water quality impacts, temporary erosion control and stabilization measures [Best Management Practices (BMPs)] would be used during construction activities to minimize erosion of soils and transportation of sediment beyond the immediate construction site. Water quality is expected to meet state and federal water quality standards. In compliance with the APDES General Permit for Construction Activities, the construction contractor would issue a Notice of Intent to the ADEC for storm water discharges associated with construction activities and, before construction, a SWPPP would be completed for ADEC review.

The designated impaired water bodies in the project area (Noyes Slough and the Chena River) remain the same with some changes concerning the causes of impairment. The Chena River is now listed only for sediment and no longer for turbidity, petroleum hydrocarbons, and grease. Noyes Slough continues to be listed for residues, sediment, petroleum hydrocarbons, oil, and grease.

Upgraded storm and drainage facilities continue to be proposed. A 1500-ft long trapezoidal bioswale would be constructed in the drainage ditch along west University Avenue, between Airport Way and the Chena River for stormwater treatment. Another trapezoidal bioswale would be built along the reconstructed Goldizen Avenue, running east 500-ft to a new Noyes Slough outfall. Vegetated bioswales are low flow trapezoidal channels, which promote the settlement of suspended solids and treatment of the associated contaminants including organics, nutrients and metals through filtration, adsorption, absorption processes. While the project estimates of increased impervious areas as a result of the project remain correct the EA

conclusion also remains valid that with incorporation of treatment measures into the project the build alternative is expected to result in reduced sediment and pollutant loading to the Chena River.

Since the time of the 2005 EA, the draft Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit covering the City of Fairbanks and the project area has been finalized and is in effect. Any necessary review and approvals will be obtained from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) to ensure conformance to the existing areas-wide permit for water quality standards, ADEC MS4 #AKS-053406.

P. Construction Impacts

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
1. Temporary degradation of water quality?	☐	☒
2. Temporary stream diversion?	☐	☒
3. Temporary degradation of air quality?	☐	☒
4. Temporary delays and detours of traffic?	☐	☒
5. Temporary impacts on businesses?	☐	☒
6. Temporary noise impacts?	☐	☒
7. Other construction impacts? (e.g. TCEs/TCPs, utility relocates, staging areas, etc.).	☒	☐

8. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments :

Since the EA was approved the following additional construction impacts have been defined in relation to temporary construction permits needed from the adjacent Chena River State Recreation Site. This is covered in more detail in the follow Section Q. and in the Section 4(f) finding documentation in Appendix E:

- A 1.85-acre temporary construction permit would be acquired along the west boundary of the park and surrounding the boat launch area to accommodate temporary construction work including:
  - construct a temporary approach to the proposed construction work bridge
  - construct a temporary approach to the proposed temporary pedestrian bridge
  - provide a temporary pedestrian path between the pedestrian bridge and the University Avenue sidewalk
  - temporarily remove and then replace the existing boat launch
  - re-contour the west boundary buffer area between University Avenue and the park.
- Limited interuptions to boat navigation under the University Avenue Bridge would occur during construction. Interuptions will be short in duration. Boaters would be directed to nearby alternative public boat lauches upstream and downstream on the Chena River while the boat launch is closed for the bridge construction season (reference the discussion on 4(f)). Vehicle and pedestrian access to the park would remain open throughout construction.
- During the paving of the parking lot, limited interuptions to traffic flow through the park may occur to accommodate passage of paving-related construction equipment. The boat launch parking lot and adjacent picnic area would be temporarily unavailable to visitors during paving operations.

The original EA indicated use of half-width construction for the bridge. Since the EA a construction contractor was hired and after evaluating all scenarios it was determined that a bridge shutdown was the most prudent option for construction of the bridge when considering all of the environmental, traffic, and Park impacts. The bridge shutdown reduces construction time by a full construction season, creating a net reduction in impact to users. Pedestrians and bicyclists would be accomodated on a temporary pedestrian bridge as mentioned above while vehicles would be routed to adjacent roadways. Traffic modeling was completed and recommendations for modifications to area signals will be incorporated into the traffic management plan for the project. Upgrades at the Geist Road/Chena Pump/Mitchell Expressway interchange

to ensure adequate operation of streets being used for detours are being completed by a separate Department project that was in design prior to the bridge shutdown concept. The signal at Airport Way and Peger Road will have minor temporary signing, striping, and signal timing implemented to ensure adequate operation at this intersection during the bridge shutdown.

Commitments to the following construction noise mitigation measures were made in the new noise analysis:

- When feasible, noise-generating construction activities should be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m.
- Locate equipment and vehicle staging areas away from residential areas when practical.
- Pile driving activities should be limited to daytime hours only, where feasible.
- Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Limit unnecessary idling of equipment.
- Comply with applicable local noise ordinances and any applicable noise regulations.

Q. Section 4(f)/6(f)	YES	NO
1. Have there been any changes to the following since the approval of the original environmental document:		
2. The status of Section 4(f) properties affected by the proposed action or the project's effects on such properties?	☒	☐
3. The determination of whether the project would "use" land from a Section 4(f) property?	☒	☐
4. The status of Section 6(f) properties affected by the proposed action?	☒	☐
5. The determination of whether the use of a Section 6(f) property is a "conversion of use" per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA?	☐	☒

If yes to any of the above, attach appropriate Section 4(f) and Section (f) documentation.

6. Describe changes, including any changes to previously proposed mitigation and/or environmental commitments:

Since the original EA, 2.85 acres of temporary construction permit areas are proposed within the Chena River State Recreation Site, a Section 4(f) and 6(f) property.

It was previously determined that the project would result in no use of Section 4(f) property and that work performed for the roadway improvements will occur exclusively within the DOTPF right-of-way and not impact the 6(f) boundary of Chena River State Recreation Site. See the 3/29/2005 park enhancement agreement, Appendix E. As a result of further design development, temporary construction permits (TCPs) will now be needed within the Chena River State Recreation Site (CRSRS) for the project.

The temporary work within the CRSRS does not meet the Section 4(f) requirement for a temporary non-adverse occupancy exception CFR 774.14(d) since it would temporarily interfere with protected activities, features, or attributes of the property. However, a Section 4(f) de minimis determination applies. The proposed temporary transportation use of the CRSRS, after incorporation of the proposed measures to minimize harm and enhance the park, does not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that qualify the park for protection under Section 4(f).

The official with jurisdiction over the park, DNR, signed their agreement with this conclusion on 4/21/2017, which can be fournd in Appendix E, after DOT&PF met with DNR on 5/11/2016 and 12/8/2016 to discuss the project. In addition, the DOT&PF published a notice in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner (2/22/17) and online (3/7/17) concerning the project's temporary use within the CRSRS. These notices are attached in Appendix E. No comments were received in reply. Taking into account the input from DNR and the public, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has made a de minimis impact finding. Upon assumption of the 23 U.S.C.

327 program, the ADOT&PF has conducted an independent review and approval of the FHWA's de minimis impact finding. The Section 4(f) documentation is found in Appendix E.

Concerning Section 6(f), DNR has recommended (5/8/17) and the National Park Service has given their approval (5/19/17) for DOT's proposed temporary non-conforming uses (TNCU) of the Chena River State Recreation Site conditioned on the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measures. See Appendix F.

Two railroad sites, Tanana Valley Railroad (TVRR) (FAI-00230) and the Railroad Crossing on University Avenue (FAI-2378), are eligible for the National Register and are therefore Section 4(f) properties. In accordance with 23 CFR 774.13(a)(1)&(2), as a result of Section 106 consultation under 36 CFR 800.5, the ADOT&PF determined and SHPO has concurred (and therefore has not objected) that the project work will not adversely affect historic properties. As a result the 23 CFR 774.13(a) exception to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval applies, and can be found in Appendix E.

V. Permits and Authorizations

	YES	NO
Have there been any changes to the status of the following permits and authorizations since the approval of the original environmental document:		
A. USACE, Section 404/10 includes abbreviated permit process, Nationwide Permit, and General Permit	☐	☒
B. Coast Guard, Section 9	☐	☒
C. ADF&G Fish Habitat Permit (Title 16.05.871 and Title 16.05.841)	☒	☐
D. Flood Hazard	☐	☒
E. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval	☒	☐
F. ADEC 401	☐	☒
G. ADEC APDES	☒	☐
H. Noise	☐	☒
I. Eagle Permit	☐	☒
J. Other. If yes, list below.	☒	☐

- Potential NOI to obtain authorization under the Excavation Dewatering General Permit for dewatering within 1500 feet of contaminated sites.

K. Describe changes:

No changes except for the following:

1. One additional permit not mentioned in the 2005 EA is needed: the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) Non-Domestic Wastewater Plan Approval.
2. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) rather than the ADNR/OHMP now isues the Fish Habitat Permits.
3. Since the time of the environmental document the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program responsibilities (General Permit for Construction Activities in Alaska) have been turned over to the State of Alaska and are now administered under the Alsaka Pollution Dishcarge Elimination System (APDES). Permit compliance by way of the program is still required.

VI. Comments and Coordination Conducted for the Re-evaluation

	YES	NO
A. Has any public/agency coordination occurred since the original environmental document was approved?	☒	☐

B. Describe all outreach and coordination efforts taken for this project since approval of the original environmental document. Discuss pertinent issues raised by the public and other agencies. *Attach applicable correspondence and responses*.

A public meeting was held on March 15, 2017. The comments received related mostly to pedestrian accommodations, traffic patterns, right-of-way acquisitions, the Geist/Jonansen Intersection design, drainage,

landscaping, and traffic speeds. The questions and tone of the meeting were not controversial. A summary of public comments and responses to those comments is located in Appendix G.

VII. Changes in Environmental Commitments or Mitigation Measures

	YES	NO
A. Have there been any changes in the environmental commitments or proposed mitigation as addressed in the original environmental document?	☒	☐

B. Describe all changes:

1. Regarding potential encounters with contamination, DOT&PF is committed to avoiding construction staging in known contamination areas, phasing underground construction work in known groundwater-contaminated areas during periods of low groundwater, and developing a contingency plan in the event that contamination is unexpectedly encountered.
2. DOT&PF will coordinate with the property owners and residents where noise mitigation appears feasible and cost reasonable based on the 2017 Noise Study to determine desires for noise abatement, if desired and cost reasonable noise abatement will be provided.

The following additional mitigation measures related to temporary impacts to the Chena River State Recreation Site have been agreed to during 2016 coordination with the DNR.

1. The boat launch that is temporarily removed for construction of the bridge will be replaced in-kind at the same location following construction.
2. The existing gravel-surfaced boat launch parking lot will be asphalt-paved following construction.
3. Pedestrian travel along University Avenue and through the park will be accomodated while the park is open and throughout construction by pedestrian detour paths and a temporary pedestrian bridge over the Chena River.
4. The temporary work and pedestrian bridges are designed to parallel the University Avenue Bridge closely to minimize temporary impacts to the edge of the park and avoid impacts to the shoreline grassed picnic area.
5. All areas disturbed by construction and without permanent improvements would be restored to by reseeding and planting of vegetation. Where park trees adjacent to University Avenue are removed for temporary construction features, trees will be replanted.
6. For temporary work within park boundaries, continued use of the park while it is open for public use (May 15 to September 15 typically) would not occur beyond six months.
7. • Fence panels along University Avenue between the park and the roadway would be replaced with 8-ft high panels (currently 6-ft high) where needed to eliminate view of the road from the park campsites. Final locations will be determined in coordination with the park based on the final roadway elevation.

VIII. Environmental Re-evaluation Determination

	N/A	YES	NO
A. The conclusions of the original environmental document approval remain valid.		☒	☐
The project meets the criteria of the following DOT&PF Programmatic Approval authorized in the Nov. 13, 2017 "Chief Engineer Directive – Programmatic Categorical Exclusions":	☒	☐	☐
1. Programmatic Approval 1		☐	
2. Programmatic Approval 2		☐	
3. Programmatic Approval 3		☐	
If yes, the Re-evaluation may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager. If no, the Re-evaluation must be approved by a NEPA Program Manager.			
B. The changes in the project scope, environmental consequences, environmental		☐	☒

VIII. Environmental Re-evaluation Determination

	N/A	YES	NO
commitments or public controversy require a new or supplemental environmental document. *If yes, consultation with the NEPA Program Manager is required.*			

VIII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Prepared by: _____ Date: 4/4/18
[Signature] Environmental Impact Analyst

Laura Sample
[Print Name] Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 4/4/2018
[Signature] Engineering Manager

Lauren Little
[Print Name] Engineering Manager

Programmatic CE Re-evaluation

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

_____
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Recommended for Approval by: _____ Date: 4-6-18
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Brett Nelson
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

_____
[Print Name] NEPA Program Manager

VIII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

EA Re-evaluation

Approved by:  Date: 4/6/2018

[Signature] ~~Statewide Environmental Manager~~ NEPA PROGRAM MANAGER

Amy L. Sumner

[Print Name] ~~Statewide Environmental~~ Manager

NEPA PROGRAM

EIS Re-evaluation

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

[Signature] Statewide Environmental Manager

_____

[Print Name] Statewide Environmental Manager